DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 958 RC 014 397

AUTHOR Johnston, A. P.; Wiles, David K.
TITLE Christian Schools and Public Schools In Small Rural Communities of the Northeast.
INSTITUTION Vermont Univ., Burlington. Coll. of Education & Social Services.
SPONS AGENCY Spencer Foundation, Chicago, Ill.
PUB DATE 1 Oct 82
NOTE 58p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Church Role; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Family School Relationship; Governance; *Government School Relationship; Grants; Parochial Schools; *Philosophy; *Private Education; Public Schools; Religion; *Religious Organizations; *Rural Areas
IDENTIFIERS *Fundamental Schools; New York; Vermont

ABSTRACT

A 1981-1982 study of the meaning of fundamental education concentrated on interviewing over 300 lay citizens, pastors, and educators in small rural communities in upstate New York and Vermont and yielded five major findings. First, little oversight or regulatory capability existed to control the fundamentalist school movement. State level governance boards "trusted" local fundamentalist schools to do the right thing. Second, locally diverse fundamentalist schools were localized phenomena with no overall coordination as a socio-political movement. Third, fundamentalist forms of schooling were a policy phenomenon of the 1970's and did not have a long history or strong ties to any well-organized regional or national effort. Consequently, personal preferences were acted upon and personal commitment to the schools was high. Fourth, the fundamentalist purpose seemed to relate Christian spirit to vows of personal and collective poverty for the school community. Fifth, fundamentalist schools rejected direct public subsidy but frequently relied on practices which constituted indirect public subsidy. Although researchers used a variety of conventional sampling, data collection, and analytical techniques, they did not identify a "best" method for this type of study; methodological looseness was necessary because of the highly personalized and contextually constrained nature of the fundamentalist phenomenon. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235958

CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN SMALL RURAL COMMUNITIES OF THE NORTHEAST

REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE SPENCER FOUNDATION

OCTOBER 1, 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A.P. Johnston

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

RC014397

A.P. JOHNSTON
UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

DAVID K. WILES
SUNY ALBANY

Acknowledgements

This study has proved immensely beneficial in that the researchers learned much about their own biases, in that the implications of the study have led far beyond the immediate schools under study, and in that we had the opportunity to talk with a number of serious, well intentioned and ethical people who ask for little else than to be allowed to go their own way.

The findings, the conclusions and the conjectures are the responsibility of the authors of the report, but we do wish to thank the Spencer Foundation for its financial support and encouragement.

We should like to acknowledge the following persons who contributed their time and effort to the study.

Colleen Fennell

Carolyn Gerdin

Nancy Hewat

Carol McGuire

Jerry Struwick

Marilyn Van Dyke

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Beyond a more accurate headcount of all school aged children in a state there is little regulatory or oversight capability to control the fundamentalist school movement. New York and Vermont have instructively different state-level patterns of regulations and education department activities. However, neither state has, in practice, the actual capability to enforce or mandate local governance conditions to fundamental schools.

> Hypothesis: the actual control relation between state level public school educational governance and local fundamental schools is one of "trust" and/or "lassiez faire" coexistence.

2. The forms of schools operating under the fundamentalist banner are a localized phenomenon with no overall coordination as a socio-political movement. There is no automatic relationship to a "television ministry" at state or national level, nor to some aggregate, formal "fundamentalist" institution, nor to some coordinated "born again" interest group constituency. However, strong efforts are currently underway to "connect" the localized phenomenon to more aggregate arrangements, especially through forms of standardized curricula and capitalizing "flare up" type local controversies which could have more generalized political implications.

> Hypothesis: The ability to rationalize a fundamentalist school as a truly "localized control" governance and educational activity creates a policy strength in the 1980's era of growing citizen suspicion to all forms of "up there" and mass media "persuasion".

3. The forms of schooling studied that were operating under the fundamentalist banner were a policy phenomenon of the last decade. There seems no necessary relationship between these schools and the larger, conventional "historical tracings" of earlier fundamental/evangelical Christian movements. Rather, the fundamentalist schools studied seem an organizational response to the 1970 s era of school transformation and uncertainties about the future of conventional parochial and public school options during the 1980s.

Hypothesis: The ability to rationalize a fundamentalist school to the present social context without elaborate historical trace creates the policy strength of direct, personalized interpretation of educational purpose which can be adapted to capitalize upon the particular expressions of confusion by conventional schools.

4. The local expression of "fundamentalist" purpose seems to relate identification of Christian spirit with "anti-bureaucratic" sentiment and with "vows of poverty" in defining school activities. There is no necessary relationship between local schools studied and the "far right" organizations at state and national levels of society which exhibit great wealth and bureaucratic organization in promoting "Christian" ideals. The fundamental school participants we studied generally claimed the need for economic sacrifice as a demonstration of personal commitment and as a cornerstone of shared non-bureaucratic local allegiance.

Hypothesis: The present ability to rationalize economic sacrifice as a positive form of fundamental school promotion is a basic policy strength in sustaining a local control, non-bureaucratic image.

5. The forms of schooling now operating under the "fundamentalist" banner present a variety of practices defining "church-state" relationships and which constitute the indirect reliance on "public subsidy". Selective use of the idea of "Lord's intervention" allows the legitimized acceptance of books borrowed from the public library, exception status in certain legal applications (e.g. handicapped) use of public sports facilities, public bus transportation, public medical facilities, achievement testing and state accreditation. The major line of non-acceptance seems to be the perceived illegitimacy of direct governmental dollar subsidy particularity as in the "new federalism" mandates of Chapters 1 and 2 of ECIA.

Hypothesis: The issue of accepting direct dollar subsidy from the public sector will provide a major ideological test for present fundamentalist schools in the next few years.

Section I

OVERVIEW

The format of this final report, intended to suggest the most substantive findings of this year-long study into the meaning of fundamental schooling, involves both data conclusions and the methodology of studying itself. After trying a variety of methodological approaches we conclude that the "investigative reporter" presentation comes the closest to meeting the test of pragmatic validity for accurately describing the "fundamental" phenomenon in the early 1980's. While we are sure the particular efforts of this pilot study could be improved upon in some future, more detailed study, we are equally convinced that making sense of this phenomenon does not lend itself to conventional "comprehensive" assumptions of traditional "causality" design. For example, this study suggests a warning to those who assume that George Gallup can measure "born again" sentiment by a stratified random sample polling procedure and casts serious doubt upon the accuracy of such aggregate generalizations as "62 million Americans" who are identified as "fundamentalists" by such methodology.

Conceptually, we find the "fundamental" phenomenon to be both contextually constrained and a highly personalized "state of mind". The actual meaning of stability of such a phenomenon in local governance is dynamic or systemic and, as such, the property space classifications used for accurate description must remain "fuzzy." In short, we found the same problem as the classic behavioral oriented decision theorists trying to mechanistically classify the "arena play" of key actors bargaining with one another. The crucial ingredient necessary to appreciate the logic or rationality of "arena play" rests both in the ex post facto interpretation of specific behavioral demonstrations and the subjective guess of "intent/motives" of what the players think as they play by the observer. To understand why a particular pastor-administrator feels a "calling" to establish a church-school or to understand why a parent of a school aged child sends their child

to such a school is largely a study of a dynamic "state of mind" phenomenon.

Similarly, to simply monitor institutional arrangements and its behavior expressions misses the most crucial element in the fundamentalist phenomenon. Strong personal beliefs and feelings may not be expressed in "purposive" institutional activities or even be capable of bureaucratic articulation. The activities and articulations which are available to "outsider" analysis may seem even more "sporadic" and "situational" than a true understanding of some generalized organizational context.

In short, there is a conceptual issue of accurately describing the continuity and stability of the "fundamentalist movement" that demands overt analytical concession to the methodological necessity of "looseness" in appreciating an interpersonal "ideological glue" phenomenon.

Given the methodological and conceptual adjustments which we found necessary to complete this pilot study there are some distinctive differences from the original proposal intent submitted to Spencer Foundation during the Summer of 1981. These differences are specified in the following sections.

The main body of the text is referenced to the five major conclusions which we summarize about the "fundamental" church-school movement in upper New York and Vermont during Fall 1981 through Spring 1982. We feel these conclusions have important policy implications if used as hypothesis framing premises by citizens and analysts in future localized study of "fundamentalism". Based upon our study, we are convinced that the social force of the "fundamental" religious phenomenon as directed toward the idea of schooling children is much more powerful and transforming than what a simple institutional adding up of "cohort membership" might suggest. First, the idea of "millions" (62 as a subset of 220) suggests an unified aggregate phenomenon which we found not substantiated by actual organization. Whatever commonality "indices" were held by the people we studied, such as viewing Jerry Falwell's Old Time Gospel Hour, were most superficial compared to the actual feelings

and beliefs of those acting out localized "fundamentalist" pragmatics. To understand the social impact of fundamentalism upon the policy context of a local community demands a detailed consideration of such organizational descriptors as actual use of public resources and services and such particularistic psychological indices as the "Lord's intervention to promote our future" in certain ideological controversies. Whether a citizen watches the "electronic church," sends money in response to mass mailing efforts by the Moral Majority or claims abstract "born again" status seems superficial in comparison to the more policy pragmatic and localized indices of 1982 fundamentalism which we observed.

Second, the social force of the fundamentalist movement cannot be appreciated by simply identifying the relatively small numbers of school aged children attending such church schools when compared to the public schools or conventional parochial schools. National or state statistics of attendance ratios are misleading in terms of pragmatic sociological strength that such "minority" numerical status might mean when concentrated in a small local community. For example, in Hartford, New York, only 3 children of 700 attended an evangelical school (Truthville) yet the social force of such attendance in influencing decisions about public resource redistribution and citizen attitudes about their public school far outweighed the simple numerical relations. Similarly, in Island Pond, Vermont the establishment of a "commune" type fundamental school was enough to mobilize the State Board of Education into action and indirectly the entire state legislature into reviewing private school legislation. We conclude that aggregate numerical calculations miss the social force inherent in localized concentration and dispersions and this feature should be noted in all forms of "central tendency" policy analyses.

After talking with pastor-administrators and parents who send their children to fundamental church schools we conclude that the social force of the 1980s movement is found in the personal sincerity and authentic expression of citizen action. As

noted in the conclusion of this report, we remain deeply concerned about any ideological movement (secular or sacred) which is governed by deterministic assumptions, particularly when coupled to fatalistic conclusions. In a similar vein we are suspicious of any movement which allows elite interpretors to justify citizen policy actions by claims of "literal" infallibility or the mystics of "divine intervention" that create self-fulfilling prophesies. There is little doubt that much of the basic articulation of the 1980s spiritual "reawakening" is based upon such ideological and political interpretations. On the other hand, the people attracted to the "fundamentalist" course are not all Hoffer's "true believers" or Fromm's robots "escaping from freedom". The people we studied represented a wide diversity of particularistic ideological and political interpretations within the generic "Fundamental" classification. Although the persons studied generally mouthed a deterministic litany we also found a pragmatic concern for their children and the future of American society that could only be interpreted as authentic and sincere--expressed directly as "what is best for my child". For such people, the church-school was perceived as one of many compensatory mechanisms designed to emphasize localized, personalized control against the nebulous, aggregate "thems" of modern social complexity. As a social investment phenomenon the church-school popularity seems, in 1982, more a "social contract" defensive type survival effort rather than a glistening eyed missionary fanaticism which will inevitably engulf the democratic social fabric of rural America.

In the final analysis, we have come to admire the psychological commitment and physical efforts of those persons who promote the Fundamental school movement within local communities in the early 1980s. The expressed feelings of philosophical justification and direct personal commitment are admirable and, most important, seem to hold the key to the possible revitalization of all forms of schools in such communities during the coming decade. In other words, the citizen appeal of the fundamental school seems not a "religious" phenomenon per se but a "civic spirit",

which could, with further transformation, also be expressed as strong commitment to Jeffersonian "publicness" within a public school institutional arrangement.

Section II

FINDINGS

Finding One: State Oversight

As was the case with state subsidy (Finding 5) to private schools so it is with state law, policy, and regulations in that there was considerable ambiguity and wide range of difference expressed among schools as to what constituted a proper relationship with the state.* At the most general level as approached from a governmental question there seemed to be a common doctrinal position, but that quickly dissolved as specific issues were traced and, even more telling, the areas of similarity even at the most general level seemed to dissolve when approached from the point of view of specific church interpretation. The real surprise was that neither law nor church ideology made a great difference in terms of oversight.

Certainly the fundamentalists with whom we talked could not be accused of being un-American. The Declaration, the Constitution and the flag are revered symbols in their daily lives. When approached from the point of view of citizenship, it was not uncommon to hear the passage from Romans cited which directs Christians to obey authority. Indeed, the government textbook for high school juniors, used by some of the schools, has the following preface.[1]

> Everyone must submit himself to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except that which God has established. The authorities that exist have been established by God. Consequently, he who rebels against the authority is rebelling against what God instituted, and those who do so will bring judgement on themselves. For rulers hold no terror for those who do right, but for those who do wrong. Do you want to be free from fear of the one in authority? Then do what is right and he will commend you. For he is God's servant to do you good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not bear the sword for nothing. He is God's servant, and agent of justice to bring punishment on the wrong-doer. Therefore, it is necessary to submit to the authorities, not only because of possible punishment but also because of conscience.
>
> Romans 13:1-7

* Meaning government generally

When asked about specific applications of this Scripture, such as the conflict involving the payment of social security for employees, it was evident that one does not always submit to authority. Rather, the passage from the Bible in which Christ responds to the Pharisees is cited with approval: render unto Ceasar those things that are Ceasar's and unto God those things that are God's. The benefits normally due to employees in the state of Vermont were not paid and still in many instances are not being paid under the rationale that the congregation is God's flock and He will look after and provide -- and, of course, the congregation provides for and protects its own members. Governmentally controlled security was therefore not necessary.

Given what appeared to be different interpretations as to what constituted a proper relationship between the Christian schools and the state, part of which was described above in terms of subsidies, it seemed reasonable to explore more generally how the local pastors and principals reacted to what appeared to be different legal contexts of New York and Vermont. Before addressing this question directly, it is first necessary to describe in general terms the legal and administrative structure of each state.

New Vermont statutes have as of this writing just come into effect and are instructive in that a number of fundamentalist pastors were actively involved with their development and in that the requirements are relatively few in number. As is described briefly in Finding Four, fundamentalist pastors became actively involved in state politics through the Vermont Association of Christian Schools (VACS), an organization formed explicitly to restrain state law and regulations governing private schools. The Chair of the House Education Committee perhaps best expressed the power of the fundamentalists in conceding that the state could not politically require more than a bare minimum.

Title 16 of VSA, Sec. 165a[2] provides for "Reporting Private Schools", one of two classifications which the private schools in the state may elect. Under this option, a school must report its calendar and have objectives to maintain attendance records, assess student progress, provide teachers and materials to cover minimum course of study and include the minimum (state) course of study in its curriculum. The only statutory reporting requirements to authorities are that the names and addresses of students are to be reported to the Commissioner (CSSO) once a year and a student no longer enrolled must be reported within seven days. Oversight of programs is left to parents who may complain to the Commissioner if the school does not teach the minimum course of study. Also, home study proposals must be submitted to the Commissioner under guidelines provided by the State Board of Education.

A second option of private schools in Vermont is provided under "Approval of Private Schools."[3] The provisions for approval are considerably more stringent in that either a state or an approved accrediting body must make a formal accreditation study of the school and recommend its approval for a school to be considered approved. Otherwise the provisions are much the same as for reporting schools.

As administrative procedures are very carefully reviewed by legislative and public scrutiny there is nothing in the proposed regulations[4] flowing from these statutes that would be of surprise. There could be changes during the next three to four months when their formal adaption is expected, but the person responsible for private school regulation expects to implement the procedures as they stand, requiring that he maintain a list of students who are enrolled in the private schools. This, he says, is primarily for purposes of responding to a local superintendent "who might call and ask about a student who he knows should be in school." This responsibility, along with that of keeping other records which essentially are concerned with brief descriptive statements of schools in operation, is all that is

required for "Reporting Schools". The procedure for "Approved School", for those who choose this option, is similar to any school accreditation process and requires no special oversight other than the decennial accreditation study. Even this is not needed by the state if a recognized accrediting body assumes this chore. This then is the extent of responsibility of private school regulation with the Vermont State Department of Education. When it is realized that, in turn, this responsibility rests with one person who carries no title indicating such responsibility, and readily concedes that as he has many other responsibilities he spends "very little" of his time with private school regulation, the extent of oversight from the state level becomes quite apparent.

In shifting the focus to local public school superintendents' responsibilities for oversight, it was learned that the superintendents in Vermont are charged with communicating directly with the private schools in their geographic area regarding availability of funds to which they (the private schools) are entitled. This, we found, had been done with great care. Beyond this was the general responsibility for truancy, as implied above, but little else.

In sum, the situation in Vermont is one of no local public school regulatory responsibilities and the part-time duties of a single individual at the SEA for such duties. Even though reporting requirements suggest state-centralized control, the reality seems more a case of trust in private school compliance, especially for those schools which choose to be Reporting Schools only, an option chosen by most of the Christian schools.

The non-registered schools in New York, however, face a considerably more formidable bureaucratic and legal struture in order to continue operation. Prior to their opening, the Department of Education recommends that they invite the local superintendent of public schools to the facility to review certificate of occupancy,

school calendar, grade levels, student names, standardized tests to be used and courses and subjects to be taught. In lieu of such invitation, the public school superintendent is to ask for such a visit prior to the opening of school. If all appears in order at the time of the visit, the superintendent is to recommend to the local board of education that the school be permitted to operate, in that it provides an "equivalency of instruction." Upon approval of such recommendation, the district should then proceed "to provide appropriate transportation, textbooks and health services."[3]

Local superintendents are presumed to know the "general character" of the nonpublic nonregistered schools operating in their district as well as "their instruction programs and the achievements of their pupils through test results."[4] If the superintendent is satisfied that an established school is offering equivalent programs of instruction, formal visits need not be made. In the case of some doubt about the equivalency, the superintendent must notify the SDE. In the case of a high school which is not registered, the SDE notifies the local superintendent. The superintendent and the local district must determine equivalency of instruction through local review (emphasis added). A procedure roughly similar in form to that of a school accreditation visit is then to be put in place with the SDE assuring the "thoroughness and fairness" of the review. If a notice of non-equivalency of instruction is issued, services from the public school are terminated and the children are considered truant.

Thus, in contrast to Vermont, local superintendents in New York are expected to not only provide services but to perform direct oversight responsibilities regarding curricular concerns in those schools which have not met formal state approval. In addition, home instruction, which in the eyes of the SDE is indistinquishable from a nonregistered school, is the responsibility of the local superintendent in terms of establishing guidelines and in directing evaluative oversight.

The New York State Department of Education has an office of the Assistant Commissioner for Nonpublic Schools whose duties range from those procedural duties indicated above regarding equivalency of instruction to the general oversight and record-keeping regarding all nonpublic schools in the State. The specific designation of an office is more formal than that of Vermont, but given the transient meaning of nonpublic schools of "record" and one person in the office, the practical limitations of the office are readily apparent.

Clearly then, it is a matter of established policy that local public school superintendents are to provide oversight of the private schools as a means of safeguarding State interests in ensuring a quality education for all students in New York. Equally as clear from our interviews, however, is the fact that superintendents are not enamoured of this responsibility, feeling that it is a matter better left to the State Education agency to regulate the private schools. Where the law provides no alternative, such as providing transportation and textbooks, the superintendents do so. But much of the direct oversight, as in the determination of equivalency, is apparently honored more in the breach than in actuality. As one New York superintendent put it, "we (the superintendents in his particular area) think that the regulation of private schools is the job of the State Department. Sure we're supposed to go in and make sure that they are in compliance, but generally, well, we just don't bother. You might say we just sort of acquiesce."

In general, the relationship between the Christian schools and the local public schools seemed amicable, if distant. The attitude on both sides seemed one of live and let live even though at the abstract level there were feelings by the Christian school pastors and administrators that the public schools were Godless secular humanist institutions, this did not translate down to individuals. Similarly, at an abstract level, the feelings among those in the Christian schools was that the

public school personnel would try to run them out of business as the private schools were taking students which would mean direct dollar benefits to the public school. This was not the feeling in any single instance of private-public school relationship, however. Public school personnel did not evidence a desire to kill off a private school, perhaps in part because they did not expect them to last or, more likely, because the schools were not only small but drew a student body from many school districts. Not uncommonly, children from six, eight, or even more school districts were in a single private school. Bluntly, the numbers of children were too small to make any real difference in economic terms.

Somewhat paradoxical to this statement from an economic perspective is that of a political view in which public school personnel either had seen demonstrated or had a sense of the political strength of the fundamentalist citizens. Whether in the press or just back-fence gossip, public school administrators clearly did not want to take action that would put them against "the little guy." There is the sense of fair play involved here but so also is the danger of adding fuel to the recent initiative by President Reagan for a tuition tax credit. An "uncooperative" public school simply makes the case for the private school. In addition, public school administrators feared the "anti-God" label, should they appear to be fighting the fundamentalist schools. In short, the explanation that makes sense economically (not sufficient numbers to make a real difference) is a function of local school jurisdictions which have little bearing on the more transcending and aggregating forces of local political strength.

Finally, and a more generous posture toward the public school administrators, the attitude of this group seemed to be hospitable, very comfortable with the idea of religious conviction dictating where a child attends school and perfectly willing to keep their distance, allowing parents to do the monitoring of curriculum.

In conclusion, it is evident that both New York and Vermont have established a body of law to deal with the regulation of private education establishments which

include those schools run by the fundamentalist churches. Each has in place policy and administrative regulations which imply the state right to protect the child, and presumably the society, from inappropriate education or, to put the matter positively, to ensure a quality education towards certain (state defined) ends. The justification for the state action is not given, but presumably it has to do with both individual enhancement and the preservation of the state.

The differences between New York and Vermont are most obviously those of legal structure, of size, complexity, and specificity of policy. The requirements of New York and the structure for implementation are in the main left to the local superintendents who are to ensure the constitutional and statutory obligations of the State. Vermont, on the other hand, has on paper a centralized structure for dealing with private schools, but little in terms of State administrative structure to deal with compliance and in any case seems to carry an attitude of local control in all things, including largely self-governing private schools.

Viewed from the perspective of actual operation, similarities between New York and Vermont are striking in that in the final analysis neither are really geared to force compliance. Rather, the assumption seems to be that compliance will be the norm, that the pastors/administrators can be trusted to comply or make every effort to do so and that even if they do not comply, except perhaps blatant infringements or practices inimical to the health and welfare of the students, the schools are better left alone. It is not so much a winking at non-compliance as it is an attitude of not wanting to know too much of what is going on. In the case of both states, the reality of "enforcement" seems based on either trust or laissez faire, which for the Christian schools, particularly those which prefer not to be registered or approved, amount to the same thing: They are left very much alone.

1. William C. Hendricks, Under God: A Government Textbook (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Christian Schools International) fourth edition, 1981.

2. Vermont Statutes Annotated (VSA) (Orford, NH: Equity Publishing Company), 1982.

3. VSA, Sec. 166a

4. "Proposed Regulations for Private Schools," Vermont Department of Education, Montpelier, VT, August 24, 1982, p.3.

5. Minimum Requirements for Schools in New York State (Albany: State Department of Education, 1980), p. 29.

Finding Two: No Overall Coordination of Evangelical/Fundamentalist Schooling as a Political Movement.

The popularized expressions of a growing fundamentalist or "born again" strength in 1980s American society, as well as the demonstrated political sophistication in the 1980 national election context (PAC subsidy of key races, Heritage Foundation analyses of federal bureaucracies) creates a strong impression of overall coordination and pervasive political control of the "grassroots" of America. The "grassroots" fundamentals we studied were coordinated and committed, but to their local communities or areas and not to national or even state levels of government and interest group influence. To try and verify this surprising (to us) finding we studied local situations for "up there" connections and analyzed certain state and national organizations for specific efforts to "connect down" with particular sites we could identify. Neither approach established grounds for plausible inference about a direct linkage between centralized and decentralized socio-political expressions of fundamental schooling. Instead, there are two discrete policy worlds, the aggregate level which appears very mobilized and in tight agreement about political strategies and the local community expressions which often appear at variance with the aggregate and with one another.

A. The Aggregate

The extent of "fundamentalist" political investment in influencing aggregate public educational policies was not the primary focus of this study. However, the national mobilization of "the conservative religious right" by 1982 seems impressive enough as a potential local influence to list several of the more potent organizations. These organizations have concentrated their policy efforts, to date, at the federal and state levels of government. They seem to have, at best, a "loose confederation" arrangement with state or area organizations by the same name when specific local educational issues emerge as particular controversies. The major local emphases has been to influence congressional elections and solicit unspecified

funding by direct mail order. The indirect, local educational involvement we found has been limited to promotion of textbooks with "pro-family" values. The following is a short "left", pro public school organization's synopsis of some of the present aggregate organizations claiming "fundamentalist" ties".

- MORAL MAJORITY, INC.

  Moral Majority, Inc. is perhaps the most visible and vocal of the ultra-fundamentalist political groups. Since bursting on the scene in the late 1970s, Moral Majority, Inc., has set the tone and pace for much of the ultra-fundamentalist political activism. The man most responsible for the direction of the organization, of course, is Rev. Jerry Falwell. Falwell is the pastor of the Thomas Road Baptist Church in Lynchburg, Virginia and celebrated preacher of the TV program, "The Old-Time Gospel Hour." Falwell has been a pioneer of TV preaching, fundraising, and ultra-fundamentalist political activism. Through its national office and state chapters, Moral Majority, Inc. is active on a wide range of "pro-family" and "moral" issues.

- COMMITTEE FOR THE SURVIVAL OF A FREE CONGRESS (CSFC)

  Paul Weyrich is the founder, inspiration, and director of this pre-eminent New Right group. With funding from brewer Joseph Coors and the direct mail expertise of Richard Viguerie, Weyrich started CSFC in 1974 to recruit, train, and support New Right candidates for Congress. To help its candidates win, CSFC provides money, media and polling consultants, field support, and other campaign assistance. Unlike the political parties and most PACs, the Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress is especially active in primary elections.

  CSFC has acquired a reputation as a pacesetter for New Right politics, in large part because of the powerful coalitions that operate under the umbrella project, "Coalitions for America." The separate coalitions co-operate to draft legislation, mobilize grassroots organizations, plan tactics to support or oppose pending legislation. The different coalitions include: the library court group, the stanton group and the kingston group.

- COUNCIL ON NATIONAL POLICY

  The Council on National Policy was founded in May 1981 as an umbrella "non-political" organization of top New Right, ultra-fundamentalist, business, and political leaders. It does not endorse candidates, lobby for or against legislation, or take official positions on policy issues. What it does is provide a forum for top leaders to trade ideas, make contracts, and plan new strategies of political action. "We share a basic commitment to moral values," said Rev. Tim LaHaye, the council's president. The goal of the group is to make the members' "shared values" dominant in domestic and foreign policy.

. THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION

Begun in 1974 the Heritage Foundation is one of the most influential and respected New Right think tanks in the country. It produces sophisticated, intellectual studies on a range of public policy issues--"everything from energy and fiscal policy to international terrorism and East-West relations," according to one of its brochures. Indeed, the Heritage Foundation turned out more than 100 policy papers in 1981 that are used by politicians and their staff, regulators, journalists, and the public. In addition to its sizable staff of analysts, the Heritage Foundation sponsors a "distinguished scholars program" for scholars around the country.

. THE FREE CONGRESS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION FOUNDATION, INC.

Founded by Paul Weyrich in 1978, the Free Congress Foundation is an influential think tank and educational group with a $1 million budget. Its mission is to spread New Right research to the public and key decision-makers through newsletters, monographs, reports, media appearances, seminars, and conferences. Much of the foundation's research is focused on so-called family issues and campaign laws and financing, reapportionment issues, and other electoral activities. The foundation's chief publications include "The Political Report," a weekly newsletter on the political scene; "The Family Protection Report," which reports on social issues like education, abortion, drug abuse, and pornography; and "The Initiative and Referendum Report," which keeps track of citizen-initiated ballot measures around the country.

. THE RICHARD A. VIGUERIE COMPANY (RAVCO)

Richard Viguerie sits at the center of many New Right networks through his computerized fundraising firm, RAVCO. Viguerie's early, innovative use of direct mail solicitations and computerized mailing lists is largely responsible for the financial success of the New Right, and has since became a entirely new medium of political education and fundraising in America. Viguerie's primacy in New Right politics is also guaranteed through his monthly magazine, Conservative Digest, a widely circulated monthly magazine, Conservative Digest, a widely circulated monthly magazine of commentary and news. The magazine features regular columns by Paul Weyrich (Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress) and Rev. Donald Wildmon (Coalition for Better Television), along with excerpted articles and speeches from many other New Right and ultra-fundamentalist leaders. Viguerie also publishes The New Right Report, a monthly bulletin of New Right activities.

. AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE EXCHANGE COUNCIL (ALEC)

ALEC is the only national organization of New Right state legislators in the U.S. Since 1973, the group has served as a clearinghouse of research, model bills, and legislative strategies for people involved in state legislation. ALEC spreads the New Right legislative agenda through workshops, conferences, a "source book" of model bills, and two monthly newsletters, The State Factor and First Reading. ALEC's model Textbook Content Standards Act, which requires schools to buy only books that reflect "pro-family" values, has been introduced in Alabama, Oklahoma, California, and North Carolina.

. THE EAGLE FORUM

The Eagle Forum is Phyllis Schafly's self-styled "alternative to women's lib." The 50,000-member group acts as an umbrella organization for a range of "pro-family" issues: the Equal Rights Amendment, the abortion controversy, the "moral" contents of textbooks, sex education, and other education and social issues. The Eagle Forum also urges its members to "support "pro-family goals such as reducing the power of the federal courts, unnecessary federal controls, and regulations."

. EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ANALYSTS

This national textbook review group is a prime source of censorship lists for more than 16,000 activists around the nation. The organization was founded by Mel and Norma Gabler, a retired couple living in Longview, Texas, to "review" textbooks and other educational materials for "objectionable" content. The Gablers have been exceedingly successful in persuading the state textbook commission to ban many textbooks and even dictionaries whose definition did not meet their approval. Since Texas constitutes 10 percent of the national textbook market, publishers have been known to modify their textbooks in order to placate the Gablers, thus affecting the entire nation's textbooks.

Although this pilot study did not find any evidence of direct contact between any of the organizations cited above and the church-schools under study, the potential for powerful intervention in a particular local context is quite obviously another matter. The ability for national groups such as this, with overlapping memberships and vast dollar resources, to selectively enter into local school matters and "mobilize political bias" seems a pragmatic reality. However, there may be great political and ideological costs in such intervention due to the fierce independence and very parochial views of the church-school incumbents toward all "them" outsiders.

B. The Local

The extent of diversity in particular religious practices and beliefs found in this study overwhelmed our initial attempts to simplify and generalize in some systematic way. What was evident from the outset was the extreme, localized variation which was evidenced within labels such as "fundamental Baptist" or "born again Methodist." It was by good fortune that we happened across the Fox Fire 7 text (edited by Paul Gillespie) which is devoted to the fundamental religions in

Appalachia. We found this documentation invaluable as a guide to make "sense" of the particular practices occurring in "North Country" New York and Vermont during 1981-82. Although the South has its own distinct "flavor" in culture the recorded rhetoric and process of religious observance were decidedly similar to the findings of this study. Understanding the underlying religious premises of "loyal" churchgoers and "called" pastors helps explain the deep seated personal suspicions and general lack of coordinated local involvement with promoters of "television ministries" and aggregate political interest group efforts.

Jerry Falwell, pastor of the Thomas Road Baptist Church of Lynchburg, Virginia and television star provides an excellent example against which to contrast the local distinctions of "fundamental Baptists" our study documented. At the most abstract creed level, the relation between the "television minister" and Baptist believers in New York and Vermont seemed to coincide exactly. The Bible is the sole source of authority in matters of faith and doctrine. Second, there is "social liberty" or freedom of conscience so that each individual is ultimately responsible for personal decisions regarding Christian faith, and God alone is the ultimate judge of human conscience.

Third, Baptists believe in immersion for those who testify to an evangelical, pietistic experience of "heart" religion. Another distinguishing quality of Baptist in general is the idea of direct descent as a line of churches from the New Testament era and thus, <u>older</u> than either Roman Catholic or other Protestant expressions of church (i.e. Methodists, Presbyterians). In each of the above expressions there seem no serious distinctions to confound policy definitions of fundamental Baptist as if they were one "unitary policy actor".

However, this study also found a major abstract expression which distinguished a particular local Baptist church (and church-school) from a supposed aggregate body. This distinction was an interpretation of the "landmark" principles which identify the <u>true</u> church on earth. Proverbs 22:28 states, "Remove Not the Ancient Landmark

Way Thy Fathers Have Set" which is interpreted to mean Jesus Christ conferred his authority upon a succession of local congregations and not on a succession of apostles. This meant to the Baptists we studied that each local church has great autonomy in determining its politics and procedures without coercion or covert manipulation from external ecclesiastical structures or spokespersons. This local autonomy creed makes for "localized" Baptists who seem somewhat suspicious and skeptical of "outsiders" no matter what form of articulation is presented.

With the exception of one "Southern Baptist" congregation in Watertown New York, the types we studied could be lumped together as "Primitive" "Independent" and "Free Will" Baptists. These three subsets form a rough continuum of internal variations in specific beliefs particularly upon membership expectations.

The primitive Baptists are the most elitist and fatalistic of the fundamental groups. Some congregations, like the Glenmont (NY) Pentacostal Church, also believe in healing and speaking in languages combined with the premillennialist assumption of the present world's "last days." The primitive Baptists, like those of the Full Gospel Church in Lowville, NY, talked of "election" which meant that God had chosen some individuals for salvation while others have not received grace or have been elected to damnation. In spite of such elitist claims, the primitive Baptists studied were not boastful, for they did not claim special knowledge of why they were elected to the chosen status. God's ways are "past finding out" and His decision to save a chosen elite is simply beyond human comprehension. The primitive Baptists may well be suspicious of Rev. Falwell's motives, for they hesitate to preach revivals or evangelical meetings calling for mass conversion; "God will awaken all those elected in His own good time".

At the other end of the continuum from the Primitives, but also sharing the fierce local deterministic spirit, are the Free Will Baptists. This subgroup believes the grace of God is for all persons who respond to the gospel demands for repentance, although all people suffer original sin, each human is free (has free

will) to choose God. In the same vein those "saved" may also choose to "fall from grace" by willfully repudiating salvation.

Groups such as the Loudonville (NY) Baptist Church and the Schroon Lake (NY) Baptists approximate the "free will" intention of this denomination. The local congregations we observed believed in immersion baptism, "Arminianism", foot washing and personal witnessing. Representatives of this version of Baptists felt Rev. Falwell was doing "good things" but should pay more attention "back home" to his Lynchburg congregation.

An intermediate subgroup, between primitive and free will Baptists, are called the Independents. The St. Johnsbury (VT) and Colonie,(NY) Baptist Church are examples of the independent version. This is the most missionary of the fundamentalist subgroups actively seeking converts to their cause. Yet this group is also the most local and "parochical" of the Baptist subgroups studied. They actively oppose centralized missionary efforts, including mission boards which might control their particular church's efforts. Their extreme local orientation ("close communion") often leads to at least detachment, sometimes attacks on "social gospel" efforts by their Baptist colleagues which detract from the "salvation" of "lost" persons. As might be expected from such a deterministic orientation, the world is out of step and their interpretations of such topics as Biblical inerrancy, personal devils, virgin birth, resurrection, and the premillenial idea of Christ's Second Coming are the only correct ones.

In summary, there are at least three subgroups of fundamental Baptists which only trust local interpretations of religious truth and find aggregate to mobilize "born again" Christians suspicious or naive. Despite a common language at a general level, the local nature of fundamental Baptist faith we studied seems too powerful to form a cohesive, purposive vested interest group at the national level of socio-political investment in the early 1980 s.

For those closely wedded to the traditional denominational references it may seem surprising that members of a local group most supportive of, and in political sympathy with a national "religious right" or "fundamental" organizations was Methodist. Further, the Methodist membership was "yoked" to Congregational and Presbyterian congregations within Hartford, New York, Jerry Falwell was perceived as an "ally", leading the fight against the "godless". We have no specific evidence of the reason for this belief but we speculate that the Methodists are, by tradition, the most centralized when they act as fundamentalist believers. Methodist structure their meaning of church organization every four years at an official General Meeting. This national conference is augmented by annual meetings held independently for five regions of the country. One Hartford respondent had attended the Northeastern region meeting as a boy when his father was a "circuit rider" preacher. In the centralized Methodist church structure local congregations have no say over who will be their pastor, and pastors can only recommend or petition for specific congregations at the Annual meeting. In Hartford, NY the constraints of such centralized authority had caused one Methodist preacher to "break" from the organization and set up his own competitive fundalmentalist church in Hudson Falls (NY) 15 miles away.

Finally, this study documented that several of the most fundamental or pentecostal of the church-school arrangements had moved beyond a specific denominational affiliation. The Hudson Falls church school was one example of an ex-Methodist situation. Even more pronounced were the Church of Living Waters in Berne (NY) and the Church of the Northeast Kingdom in Island Pond, Vt. This form can only be described as utopian commune efforts, with fundamental schooling a subpart of a larger "live in" fundamentalist ministry. Eligibility to be included in either of these experiences demands a "true believer" orientation. The pastor who governs "His Farm" of the Church of Living Waters has attended some Moral Majority meetings and, while encouraged by the conservative trend, is skeptical

of "involvement in politics as opposed to work of the Lord." Such is true as well with the Church of the Northeast Kingdom, even with its very recent origins in the deep south (Chattanooga, Tennessee). Like "His Farm", the focus of fundamental religion in the Northeast Kingdom is intensely local and only articulated as a mystic orientation that permeates all daily life striving for community autonomy and self sufficiency.

In summary, we found an extreme amount of localized diversity in the various expressions of fundamental religion and schooling. We also found a consistent barrier between such localized expression and aggregate claims of "fundamental" religion organization in the fall of 1981 and the spring of 1982.

Finding Three: The Recent Establishment of the Fundamentalist Schools

The historical link between the fundamentalist church-schools and earlier public schools which stressed religion, indeed in which pastors were the teachers, where the King James Bible was read and where both prayer and Bible were a part of the curriculum, has not been missed by the fundamentalist pastor/administrator. Fundamentalist schools <u>are</u> what America's schools <u>were</u> is an expression of the historical roots which are felt by the contemporary schools. But this is at best a vague and abstract connection not unlike an affirmation of any combined sacred-secular abstraction which might come together in such a phrase as "one nation under God". Viewed separately, the secular trace is "Americanism" and the sacred is the history of a particular church. The latter we found to be particularly pronounced among the Baptists who are fond of citing a genuine "fundamentalism" dating back to their persecution by the Romans and the Spaniards. As the churches are viewed as themselves educational organizations, of which "the schools" are only one manifestation, it is not unusual to be told of a history much longer than the institutional meaning of established school. In the sense intended by the researchers, however, the fundamentalist schools have been far more recently established, a point which will be elaborated in a moment.

Another source of confusion regarding the dating of the establishment of a school is the long but almost entirely hidden history of home instruction which may or may not have been combined with a public school instruction for some children. Fundamentalist school administrators made the distinction between institutional and personal quite readily but the pastors seemed a little reluctant to do so. The reluctance of the latter could be a feeling stemming from a thorough-going doctrinal position or, as implied by one more "secular" pastor, a deliberate blurring in order to make the

case of "schools" having operated independently, even if a bit below the surface, for a long time with no apparent harm to either child or state.

From a state perspective the general picture of establishment of fundamentalist schools is not particularly clear for on the one hand there is a candid admission of not being at all certain of even present data much less that of having great faith in past records. Schools might well have come and gone without even a blip on the (state) screen. Even given the records available, it is instructive that it has been only in the last two years that New York State has separated out in their data the children attending fundamentalist schools from the "non-demoninational" private schools and shifted them to an "other religion" category. The State of Vermont has only this year attempted to list the schools at all, but with no assurance that the list is a complete identification of all of the schools. Moreover, the fundamentalist pastor/administrators have varying estimates as to the total number of schools and know very little about the history of the fundamentalist schools in the area.

In brief, it was often not possible for this research to go beyond the data presented in the interview in a systematic search for the historical tracings of now operating fundamentalist schools. The pastor of the only school which we found "in operation" for more than a decade was a bit vague on its origins, saying, in effect, that it all depends on what you call a school. What we did find from our discussions was that most of the schools had been established during and since the mid-1970s. There was no instance that we found of an "outside" person or movement that directed or even encouraged the establishment of any of the schools. On the other hand, the establishment of so many schools within a two to three year time period presents the research with a situation which cannot reasonably be supposed to be coincidental.

*The researchers were not infrequently asked about the names of pastors and administrators in other schools and were queried about size, place and number of schools.

The best that we could learn was that pastors as well as individual citizens from various churches talked informally and read church literature and the popular press, responding very much on their own.* In one case a pastor said that he was pushed into setting up a school by parishoners, several said that discussions about a school just started with no particular person remembered as the originator and two pastors clearly took the credit for "starting the ball rolling" as one put it.

It was tempting to try to fit theoretical structures of political or other meaning to the establishment of fundamentalist schools particularly in light of the virtually nationwide attention which these schools have commanded, especially during the past five years. From the small number of schools in which we conducted interviews, however, it was not possible to do more than to say that people were almost assuredly influenced by the larger political-religious context (e.g. Falwell) but were acting on their own feelings and certainly with their own time, effort and pocketbooks.

On still another level, it was interesting to attempt a description of the more specific causes of the establishment of the fundamentalist schools. To accomplish this the research took two tacks, one aimed at the broader meaning of fundamentalism and the second the more direct "reasons" provided by parents and pastor-administrators for why children enrolled in a particular fundamentalist school.

* It should be underscored here that we are speaking in terms of the <u>establishment</u> of the schools. This is not to overlook a number of associations and developed "curriculum packages" that almost all had bought into, but these seem more <u>after the fact than causal</u> in establishing a school.

The first prong of this aspect of the research was further subdivided into two parts, the major portion of which was to do a study of the meaning of fundamentalism in one particular community (Hartford, New York). The essence seemed to boil down to a feeling that there are "others" who have a significant amount of control over the daily lives of individuals that is not only unnecessary but, more importantly, that does not serve the needs of the people, and even more importantly, that runs counter to the desires of the people as they live their lives daily in rural small-town America. The examples given have to do with everything from the determination of postal routes to a criticism of the lack of discipline in the schools.

The second part of this broader meaning of fundamentalism was to query the pastor-administrators on their feelings regarding environmental issues and the "destiny to hasten the Second Coming of Christ" mentality. The latter query yielded responses that ranged over the entire political spectrum. There was one pastor who was making investments in satellites and a radio station--a belief in the future as perhaps portrayed by the Reagan administration (more of the same for America). The desire for a stable state that includes small is beautiful and environmental protectionism was also expressed: "the Lord helps them who helps themselves," "God gave us the brains to use but not to abuse His house," but so also was the idea that God will soon come again, "that's the next thing on the docket", and will save those who have been born again (presumably everyone else dies). In short, one could not attribute the formation of the schools as a "getting right with God" movement against the great uncertainties if by these we mean the uncertainties associated with the "natural" calamities of flood, insufficient fuel, acid rain, or a starving world. Nor, it seems, could one attribute the founding of the schools to the need for strong sacred statement concerning the need to be "saved" before the Second Coming. This, to the extent that it is doctrine, is accomplished by the church.

While the researchers would not deny broad sacred/secular ideological causes for the establishment of the schools, the responses which we received suggested that the primary impetus was closer to the direct effects of schooling. That is, when the question was asked of parents, pastors and administrators as to why children were placed in the fundamentalist school, the response was almost a litany of talk about the lack of academic standards in the public schools, the lack of public school student discipline and, less often, the need for a Christ-centered or Bible centered education was cited. In every school which we visited, the curriculum stressed "the basics" (for example, the ACE curriculum), student obedience, respect for the teachers and school, and, of course, some measure of Bible readings, prayer and other religious activities.

Aside from these "no surprise" reasons for the development of the church schools, several comments were made which, while without a great deal of confirmation in the study, may be of some interest to a larger study. First, one administrator suggested that many of the parents of the children in his school sought application in a time of crisis. The crisis may be a problem with grades, with lack of motivation or even a run-in with the school bus driver, but, he said, there was often some incident that either triggered the parents into action or perhaps was the primary causal factor in deciding to seek out a fundamentalist school. This point of view was, however, denied by others.

A member of a school board of a fundamentalist academy who also happend to be employed by the public schools suggested that it was a family-like closeness of the school that was a major factor in drawing students to the school. The particular conditions of this school, were, however, that it was <u>open only to church members</u> and the parishoners were involved with church activities with their children at least twice, often three times each week. More specifically, he outlined particular activities

that drew on the strengths of families working together, taking trips together and praying together. As the teachers in the school were always a part of these activities, the children, the parents and the teachers came to know each other as family. The tip-off on the overt expression of this value may be the insistence by some church-schools that even if the parents are not all parishoners, the teachers should be. Curiously, the pastors involved in the four schools with this policy seemed to downplay the "family" orientation as a major drawing card, a finding that gives caution to the above speculation.

In summary, the fundamentalist schools which we studied do not have a long history, do not have strong ties, other than vaguely ideological, to a "fundamentalist movement" and certainly do not fit an historical pattern of some well orchestrated nationwide or even region or statewide effort. Time and again the importance of local and immediate concerns were expressed as these were played out in the particular social contexts of each church and school. What this research found was local people acting locally on their concerns, not a response to a particular ideology or a tradition to be honored within the fundamentalist movement, but a means of directly taking care of their own without being owned by a history.

It is our speculation that the absence of history and tradition, combined with the lack of binding ties to a nationwide political-religious doctrine or institution, creates a condition in which direct preferences can be and are expressed and acted upon. A lack of resources and the constraints of only now learning how to establish and operate a school have become, we would guess, central strengths in providing multiple opportunities for direct expression of preferences, of working towards stated preferences and of encouraging others to do the same. The pastor presumably plays the key role in leadership, but the family style church-school seemingly evokes an almost unbelievable level of personal commitment to the school.

Finding Four: Fundamentalism, Anti-Bureaucratism, and Vows of Poverty

The blur of labels, such as conservative and liberal and fundamentalism, makes these conventional political distinctions all but meaningless for the small church-school context, for at the heart are direct, personal relationships which form the personal bonds that forge expectations of religious, social and economic sacrifice. Everyone---parents, church members, pastor and teachers--- is called upon to work and to make a variety of sacrifices in the name of the Lord. Sacrifice seems an important part of the lives of those involved in a "communal" existence, one of working together towards an end greater than any individual as well as towards an end greater than the particular church/school. Shared goals and shared work not only make the personal sacrifice worthwhile, but such a sacrifice enhances the goals and the meaning of work.

Tuition for students constitute the major parental sacrifice with charges ranging up to approximately $1000 with the median charge around $600 to $700. There were two cases of no tuition charge, both schools organized as a communal arrangement (see Finding Two) in which time was considered money. In one instance, teaching was perceived as an economic work assignment of certain persons living in the church's community. As "outsiders" attended school, it was hoped that their parents would find it appropriate to contribute. The pastor of the church and commune indicated that people should give as much "love and whatever" as they can. About those who do not contribute, he said "if they can live with that money, I can live without it and the Lord will provide." In another instance of no tuition, the teaching was done informally in a commune by virtually every adult, though some "teachers" were also assigned formal teaching tasks.

Irrespective of the financial arrangements, however, it was evident that the schools were often leading a hand to mouth existence but assured with the expectation that the Lord would indeed provide. For example, a creditor of one

school which was carrying a $35.00 overdue account was told that the school was having difficulty but that he would be paid "soon". As the annual budget of another school was explained to the parishioners and parents, the pastor-administrator told stories of the circumstances under which an unexpected "god sent" donation was received, a loss was replaced by volunteer effort, and one family with three children who actually paid full tuition for the next year in advance. Perhaps most remarkable to our study team was that no person in the audience questioned the wisdom of operating out of the following year's revenue. When one investigator queried the headmaster--"don't you get terribly nervous about operating like this?"--he was answered with the standard assumption of faith that the Lord will take care of the church.

"If the parents want their children to get a Christian education", said one board member of a private school, "tuition is their necessary sacrifice." One pastor picked up on the theme of sacrifice relating it not only to finances, but to broader life struggles and how such adversity builds individual and community strength in the 1980s. The limiting of fund drives, car washes and bake sales to members of the church and parents of children in the school perhaps best underscores the feeling of "providing for ourselves" as directed by Scripture.

Nor is sacrifice limited to those who give, but extends as well as to those who teach and work at the schools. Teacher salaries in the range of $6000 are not all uncommon but such relatively meager pay is looked upon by teachers, pastors and parents as being a certain indication of the person's calling to Christ, to teaching, and as a contributing factor in building the rapport so necessary to the total environment of the school. Teachers were expected to not only carry out their assigned school duties but to attend night and weekend meetings, and not infrequently, helping with church affairs. In one instance the teachers pitched in to help build the physical facilities which were built entirely with donated time by the church and school community.

There was considerable distancing of the individual churches from well-known nationwide organizers and organizations with generous wealth. Certainly there was no local expectation of receiving dollar benefits from them. The reaction to Jerry Falwells' electronic church ranged from that of an assessment of the good but inadequate works to one of slight hostility. In all cases the criticism was that such TV ministries were not sufficient to attend to the actual needs of people and, in particular, could not develop that sense of community so much needed in Christian gospel. This attitude is best summed up with the expression that "TV church is okay as long as he (the TV minister) doesn't forget to tell the people that watching TV is not enough." Hostility was expressed, however, by those who felt that the likes of Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson were draining off much needed dollars from local parishes and were not delivering the needed personal services. As expressed by one pastor "where will Jerry Falwell be when the sick need visiting?" and "Jerry Falwell will not be at the grave site." In the main it seems fair to say that the local pastors neither symbolically affiliate or disaffiliate their churches with either nationwide TV ministries or the national far right groups discussed elsewhere in this report. Rather, such organizations seem to be treated largely as spectacle and not relevant to local efforts.

The "outsiders" who constitute a rallying point for the insiders to coalesce against are clearly the "bureaucrats" associated with all levels of public schools as well as other public sector enterprises. Anti-bureaucratic sentiment sometimes runs high, for it is this group that is perceived as having pushed not only "unreasonable requirements and restrictions", but has become "fat, lazy, unresponsive and, worst of all, has forced children to learn secular humanism as the one right way."

The bureaucratic regulations which local schools <u>can</u> live with, said one pastor, have to do with the need for " fire extinguishers, exit signs and metal waste baskets, but that's about it." This sentiment is most graphically portrayed by the incident

of a fire in a Christian school in late summer 1982. The pastor refused, on principle, to permit the fire marshall to investigate. This is the extreme, but anything beyond safety and health requirements, such as the need to accommodate the handicapped with elevators or ramps, of requiring the reporting of names and addresses of children and, above all, of directing what should be taught, are forms of regulation which is, at the very least, subject to negotiation. The intensity of the fight against the "they" (federal-state-local authorities) can perhaps best be measured by the four-year-long struggle in Vermont to get through the legislature a requirement for reporting students, the keeping of records and a good faith promise (see Finding Five). The media coverage of the events just prior to and during the 1982 legislative session were extensive. Pastors cast themselves as martyrs on the pyre of the state, ("I am ready to go to jail for as long as necessary") fighting the "obvious" attempts on the part of the state to ultimately control the schools.

The pervasivness of the expression of anti-bureaucratic sentiment in the media, in church and school gatherings, and in private conversation is unmistakeable. It is the researchers' interpretation that it is honestly felt but also used as a way of cementing the insiders to a shared experience. Even more, the charge against the bureaucrats seems to be a way of championing the underdog in the fight with the rich and powerful state, long an American tradition. The sense of cohesiveness and the belief in rightness of cause is clear, for the battles won, for example against the handicapped requirements, are the work of the Lords' intervention: "The Lord blessed us last week with receiving an exemption for handicapped access."

The major caveat to this discussion is that there are differences among the pastors and administrators on each of the points. None of the fundamentalist schools which we visited were lavish or showed gross display of wealth. Some were very poor, operating with minimal facilities and staff and were barely making it. This gives credence to the remark frequently heard among public school personnel that the small Christian schools appear and disappear quite often in the upper New York, Vermont region.

On the other hand, some seem at least for now firmly rooted ideologically and likely to be able to draw upon the strength of ideology to turn religious preferences to dollars.

Similarly, there are differences regarding the distance which various schools wish to keep from affairs of the state. The range is from hostility to the seeking of public school accreditation, with most schools lying in the middle ground of cautious and very guarded relationships. Most seem willing to fight bureaucratic encroachments but also are conceding the point that some state oversight is not innimical to their interests.

In summary, whether it be by conscious strategy or the happenstance and powerful effect of "new" ideology, the local pastors associated with the small Christian school have managed to weld together a relatively poor working class constituency and to place that very condition at the heart of their efforts to establish schools. It is almost as if the struggle is itself the important point and the fact of students in attendance per se a confirmation of the value of the struggle. Having powerful, rich and competitive neighbors (the public schools) does not necessarily create hostility but does provide a convenient fulcrum from which to appeal to the higher fundamentalist cause of serving God. Taken together, the vows of personal and collective poverty and the need to be vigilant in guarding one's religious rights constitute a powerful force for the Christian schools.

Finding Five: Reliance on Indirect Public Subsidy

The national organization, Americans United for Separation of Church and State, has argued vigorously against public subsidy for private schooling, invoking Thomas Jefferson's concept of a "wall of separation" between church and state. This separation includes such things as compensatory subsidies under the old Title I of ESEA, transportation of pupils, tuition tax credits, vouchers and the like. Similar ideological lines toward "separation" seem drawn by the Christian schools, but the pragmatic variations among schools is considerable in operational terms.

In New York State, for example, transportation in public school buses for children attending the Christian schools is a common practice and does not raise an ideological issue. In Vermont, no transportation for children attending the Christian schools has been provided and has never been requested to our knowledge. In a similar vein, the State of New York has required academic achievement testing for first year students which is administered by the State Department of Health and which must be given to all students. As the state pays for the tests and for the test scoring service, this constitutes a direct subsidy of a type that would not even be considered in Vermont. Indeed during the period of this study, suggestions made in Vermont for similar requirements, though not necessarily at state expense, were quickly quashed by the Christian schools on the ground of state interference.

The chief point of these examples is that the ideological principle of separation of church and state is asserted by all local pastors in small rural areas of a similar region, but different kinds and levels of state subsidy are actually accepted at the operational level. Ideological interpretation into actual operation in this instance seems to follow the lines of different state political cultures. New York State has an established history of providing transportation for parochial students and even a longer history of student testing (regents) at state direction. Vermont,

on the other hand, has neither history and, it may be reasonably argued, has not developed a similar sense of state responsibility. Therefore, the private schools have little tolerance for the initiation of new state regulations "just for them" in the early 1980s.

On the other hand, to reiterate a recurring theme of this study, local pastors/administrators cannot be locked into a pattern of static sameness, even to generic political cultures, with any predictive reliability. To look more closely where the ideological lines are drawn on the "church-state" issue from a perspective other than broad political culture, the position of three schools in Vermont may be compared. All are Independent Churches. One school (described in the paragraph under the third perspective below) has sought and received state accreditation* for secondary only, arguing that "child benefit" (college admission) outweighed possible state interference in making such a control decision. Such accreditation required, of course, certification of teachers according to state standards. But when the state board of education and state legislature became interested in 1980 in re-opening the whole question of the regulation of private schools, this particular school decided to put its application for renewal of accreditation on hold and joined the Vermont Association of Christian Schools, a (primarily) political action group to fight mandatory requirements. In other words, the tipping point for state regulations, the point at which it outweighed child benefit, was nearly reached with the new regulations as described in Finding one.

A second school run by an Independent Baptist Church, also a member of VACS, is violently opposed to any state regulation other than the health and safety of the children. So jealous is the pastor of his independence that he wishes no inspection even by ACE whose curriculum he uses. "They (ACE) have no more right to come in here to tell us how to teach than the man who sold us the Electrolux has a right to tell us how to clean." Teacher certification is no indication of teacher excellence,

* Accreditation and similar official designations of acceptance constitute symbolic borrowing from the state as well as real dollar expenditures for the state.

"we proved that in court" (by teacher testimony) and is therefore not required. Clearly the state is not perceived as a benign entity.

Finally, a school run under the auspices of an Independent Church which is not a member of the VACS not only requires teacher certification but has sought and maintained state accreditation for its programs. The feeling is that the VACS is a political action group that may end up doing more harm than good, organized as much for the promotion of one pastor's political interest as much as anything else. But even more pointedly, the pastor of this school stated that while certainly too much state control is not welcomed, "we have not reached that point yet" and he has no fear that the state is being or will be unreasonable in its future demands.

Still a third perspective of ideological lines may be seen by looking at how the issue of church-state has been dealt with at the operational level within a single school. A pastor in Vermont felt that it would be hypocritical to take public subsidy and still make a claim to freedom under the "no exercise clause" of the First Amendment. Public subsidy, he went on to say, is an invitation to government control. In the first year of operation, his school made "the mistake" of taking milk subsidies from the Department of Agriculture, but nothing after that. On the other hand, this same school has virtually no library and the administrator and the secretary take book orders from teachers once a quarter and go to the public library to check out some 300-400 books for two to three months. In a similar vein, this school uses public school gymnasium facilities for a nominal charge (far under the cost of operation). Indeed, there was some anger expressed when one local school system, whose facilities they had been using, held firm to a cost-of-operation charge.

To summarize to this point, an argument could be made for between-state differences on the issue of church-state but this perspective is by itself inadequate to explain what local pastors in both states are thinking. A second perspective

on this issue pointed up the within-state differences among three schools which might well have been judged on prima facie evidence to be quite similar in outlook. Finally, a third perspective, that from within a single school, was to demonstrate questions which arise in sorting out what does or does not constitute state subsidy. While espousing the principle of church-state separation, the wall of separation was permeated by the school on its own terms.

As it happened, the federal law and regulations as well as proposed federal law regarding aid to all schools, public and non-public alike, was changing during the course of this investigation and provided an opportunity to explore further the ideological commitments to the separation of church and state. Specifically, the issues were those of direct dollar subsidy under the new Chapters I and II of ECIA and, even further, of the possibility of tuition tax credits and vouchers for education.

Even though these questions were framed for research during the investigation, it is instructive that the investigators made two conceptual assumptions which were "challenged" before collection scarcely got started. The first was the local Christian schools, which had been by this time contacted by local public school superintendents about dollar amounts which were "due" them under Chapter II, would be reasonably knowledgeable about the provisions. Our research actually found that there was a range from general awareness of a change in the law (but little specific information) to one of complete unawareness of a new concept in direct federal aid, especially regarding Chapter II (collection in Spring 1982).

The second assumption we made was exemplified in the way that the researchers formed the questions. It was assumed that since Chapter II was almost completely "no strings attached" money that at least some, perhaps most, of the Christian schools would be interested. Based on that assumption, we were interested in <u>where</u> they would spend the money or, if they did not take it (or took it with great caution), what <u>level(s)</u> of government they most feared in terms of future control over their programs.

At the time of the interview, only two Christian schools could be found that were even considering the use of Chapter II funds. Moreover, the rejection of Chapter II was not primarily on grounds of government control per se but rather on ideological grounds of a separation of church and state, approached not from a governmental perspective but from the point of view of God's will.

The first faulty assumption of knowledgeable pastor/administrators was met by a brief explanation of the new law by the researchers and a dollar figure, obtained from the State Education Agency, of their eligibility for Chapter II funds. All pastors/administrators indicated that they had been contacted by local school district personnel, but had either rejected the offer outright or "put it aside". The process of inquiring about this issue revealed two interesting side points. First, there were some instances of the pastor/administrator alone making the decision to not apply for the funds without asking the school board or local congregation. Secondly, we found one instance of a pastor and an administrator of the same school who disagreed on the issue, again revealing a possible split in the making.

The second assumption was not totally invalid in that government control is feared, not apparently at any level in particular, but just a free-floating anxiety of the "they" who wish to control, to make the Christian schools more like the public schools so that they (private) would not attract students. More important, however, was the feeling that it would be against God's will to take direct dollar subsidies. The argument is that in the natural state of things God said that, in the words of a Vermont administrator "we should look out for our own. This includes food, shelter, transportation and education. Ideally each family, the basic unit, should provide for their own, including education" but since the latter is often not possible, the parents must at least have the option of sending children to a school of their choice.

If this interpretation of fundamentalist doctrine proves to be pervasive, it establishes an ideology which effectively nullifies the possibility of direct dollar subsidies to the Christian schools. The Chapter 2 dollar amounts at this juncture are quite small by any measure, but the point is what the policy of the Christian schools would be in the event of tuition tax credits or education vouchers. It is difficult to predict what will happen, for neither the pastors nor the administrators with whom we talked had given it much thought. Even if they had, the reality of large dollar amounts, enough let us say to pay two thirds or more of the cost of tuition, may be more difficult to turn away. The question of vouchers would be more of a head-on clash of ideology in that the voucher plans with which we are familiar would require that checks be drawn for students by some level of government. The tuition tax plan, it would seem, might be justified in that the money due the government is simply never paid (or paid and refunded). We have only a hint of the ideological test in that in one school there was a question of whether or not to provide the forms to the parents of graduating seniors to apply for BEOGs to assist with college costs. Evidently there was some split among parents on the issue.* In any case, the issue could well cause a major problem among and more poignantly <u>within</u> the fundamentalist schools and become an ideological test which many would rather not face.

* The case involving Bob Jones University several months ago may raise the question of whether fundamentalist colleges will even permit to have such loans in the future since it compromises the college position.

Section III

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted between Fall 1981 and Summer 1982 and involved lay citizens, pasters, and educators living in small rural communities throughout upstate New York and Vermont. Without making the conventional methodological claims of an "exclusive or exhaustive" analysis for reasons cited below, we do feel confident in the gross parameters generated as conclusions in this study. Our confidence is based, primarily, on interviews with more than 200 individuals who represent the "fundamentalist" interest and over 100 people who are associated with or interested in the public school organization. Although primarily concerned with local community expressions, we also interviewed a number of individuals representing state legislatures in New York and Vermont, members of the State Education Department in each state, regional and statewide educational interest groups and national organizations purported to represent either the fundamental or public school interests.

Most of our local interviews concentrated in certain geographic areas and this should be noted in the conclusions about "state" orientations. The specific areas of most research concentration include Albany, Hartford, Warrensburg, Speculator and Lowville, New York as well as Burlington, Irasburg, St. Johnsbury, Graniteville-Westerville, Canaan, and Rutland, Vermont. State, regional and national associations (non-denominational) include Educational Conference Board (New York), Accelerated Christian Education Inc., Northern New York BOCES (Board of Cooperative Educational Services), People for the American Way (Albany Chapter), Coalition for Democracy in Education (Saratoga Springs, New York) and the Vermont Association of Christian Schools.

There were several specific efforts which we made to try to be "conventional" in our research format. The problems with design conventionalities that concerned the "who and how" of doing a study, (not to mention our biases toward the

seemingly more important, "what" to study) led to our methodological conclusion about "case of 1" or "small group" contextual appreciation for understanding of this particular type of complex social phenomenon. The pragmatic necessity of discontinuing some a priori conventional research assumptions about "proper" approach also seemed to lead our ability to make honest conclusions about a policy phenomenon. We found "fundamentalism" to be organizationally expressed as a "local" and "predominantly variable" person phenomenon.

A. Who and How do we study?

To solicit information for this particular type of pilot study we assumed that classic "Campbell and Stanley" designs[2] and the George Gallup type "sample the total" formats were not complete in themselves. The Turner, Tomenendal and Ballweg dissertations seem a good example of the kind of knowledge[3] which can be garnered by these types of methodological assumptions. We tried instead, to combine both the "sample of opportunity" and the "knowledgeable insider" sampling formats.[4] For example, the sample of opportunity was primarily used to solicit opinions of fundamentalist pastor-administrators in the Albany area during Fall 1981 and during the entire year long study in Vermont. Specific "insider knowledgeable" samples were drawn from both the Hartford, New York and Caanan, Vermont local communities as well as from the BOCES public school administrators in the Adirondack, New York region. The information gathered by both approaches could not be differentiated on some impartial evaluative criteria of "quality" or "relevance" when the two data bases were compared by the study team. We suggest that the combination of "opportunity" and "insider" provides the best of both "access" worlds[5] within this type of "multiple perspective" methodological paradigm.

It should also be noted that our study did not utilize "complete, extended immersion" as a data collection technique and "proper" study approach. This lack of use is not intended to raise the question of whether "immersion" gathers better or worse "policy relevant" data, but just to clarify that we did not have

the resources or personal inclination to make such an investment.[6]

The methods by which data were collected consisted of both structured and semistructured interview schedules. A coordinated research team and the principal investigators acting as separate individuals used both kinds of schedules during the year of study. Again, it was impossible for us, in retrospect, to systematically assess the positive and negative contributions of various approaches to the reality of the data; in other words, no judgment of "best" could be clearly assigned to type of interview control or study process in collecting information on this phenomenon.

In this study the more structured interview concerned Chapters 1 and 2 of ECIA and, for reasons explained earlier, were not particularly helpful in interviewing fundamentalist pastor/admin. in late spring 1982 (see Finding "what" asked discussion). The semi structured interview was used in Hartford (see appendix), while the least structured set of questions were used in the initial polling of the fundamental school organizations around Albany and Burlington in Fall 1981. The one hard conclusion that can be reached is that "loose" initial questioning does not automatically evolve into more "certain questions" and more "structured" format for this area of inquiry. The 1980's socio-political meaning of "fundamentalism" in school operations seems to be evolving too rapidly for such a conventional capture.[7]

We also concede that this study did not allow either an "interviewer-to-interviewer" or "interviewer-team" comparison that would stand pragmatic tests of true qualitative difference"; tests subject to empirical verification. Our "hunch" is that certain student members of the team may be the most accurate describers of all the individuals which were involved as information solicitors in this particular study.

B. What do we study?

The global assumptions that the principal investigators made about the pragmatic

meaning of the "fundamentalism" phenomenon at the time of proposal writing and securing Spencer funding (Summer and early Fall of 1981) were to prove to be superficial and naive when compared to actual study findings. We assumed implicitly some "grand conspiracy" connection was already in real life operation as the prophets of "televised ministry" seemed to control their "true believer" followers. After a year's study we now conclude this is not the pragmatic nature of either the "fundamental" citizens or educators now living in upstate New York or those living in Vermont. Further we infer these normal, real-life people are not absolutely different from citizens and educators living throughout 1982 rural America and supporting public schools. The pragmatic meaning of "fundamentalism" which is ideologically believed in and operated upon is as variable as the "predominance of sentiment" held by actual people living daily in small, rural communities.

It is true that we did find concentrations of individuals and social congregations of "hard core true believers". For example, Glenmount, NY Pentecostal Church, The Berne, NY "Church of Living Waters", the Island Pond, Vermont "commune" and the mass ACE rally held in October 1981 in Albany seem to meet Eric Hoffer's definition of deterministic and mechanistic policy stances, but certainly these people did not represent all local concentrations or even some hypothetical "majority" in upstate New York and Vermont. As a study of organization vested interest that has highly visible "ideological glue" characteristics, we found it makes pragmatically verifiable policy sense to predominantly consider this as a personalized phenomenon. The assumed Moral Majority control/compliance relationship to actual citizen lives is as tenuous as any other aggregate institutional mechanism in today's society.[9]

Our attempts to secure a common or general description of the "fundamentalism" phenomenon took the form of testing five distinct paradigms of certain premises;

1) try to find their common "ideological glue",

2) try to find their common "language form",

3) find their "power structure",

4) find their "power network" and

5) find out their knowledge of "modern" technological/rational articulations of "policy issues".

While we doubted our own ability to aggregate specific findings into a truly substantive generic "ah ha" about each of the five (see our disclaimers to "pilot" in Spencer Foundation proposal), we felt an effort at accurate description of each premise as pragmatically expressed in the 1981-82 study would be the important outcome in its own right. These claims to accurate description are the basis of the five conceptual conclusions found in the "Executive Summary" of this report. While we feel confident in the gathered data, the methodological issue of presenting "legitimate" paradigms used for different forms of articulation remains. We caution the reader against assuming static or superficial over-generalized meanings in our use of placeholder terms like "monolithic power structure" in the Hartford Community or "faith healing" as a general expression of "Living Water" community inhabitant beliefs.

(1-2): Our systematic inquiry into the "ideological glue" and "common language form"[10] of fundamentalists took place in the earliest phases of the study. What we documented instead of actual commonality was extreme operational variation in the personal interpretation of either premise. There did seem to be common abstract allegiance to the "rightness" of a localized "daddy knows best" hierarchy within most school structures studied, but not an operational generic set of organizational identifiers. The closest common empiric parameter we found was the rejection of direct dollar subsidy from public government and a pervasive feeling of oppression and impending doom about 1980s America and the world. The oppression was categorized abstractly as "them" located beyond the immediate local context while "doom" was the inevitability of "Armageddon". Even in the latter expression of perceived truth there was some intellectual

concession to how close "at hand" meant in terms of world destruction and if the Armageddon issue was an "all or nothing" affair (i.e. "good" people survive "limited" nuclear war mentality).

Within these three broad commonalities of the fundamental population studied, our findings were that the individuals' religious expressions of "fundamental" forms were neither a unitary, all pervasive "glue" which directly controlled operations nor a specific language base capable of distinctive actor identification. On the other hand, there was a common abstract litany which all pastor/administrators in this study delivered. It centered on sworn allegiance to the "King James Version" of the Bible as "literal" truth, the "Second Coming" of Jesus, and the "godless secular humanists" that are now assumed to govern the public schools. Beneath this abstract litany, however, was a variety of personalized concessions to real-life contextual meanings; these ranged from intellectual acknowledgements of real-life 1600-1640 England (for King James translation) to many forms of accepting indirect subsidy from the public schools. Public school administrators and local citizen boards might be "godless", but the evangical "Lord could intervene and operationally allow subsidized public busing of "fundamentalist" children, academic testing, use of public school sports facilities and other concessions to the both-and reality of local human community social organization and bureaucratic institutional survival.

(3): This study attempted both the "loose" and "tightly knit" power structure premises to try to methodologically describe the fundamentalist phenomenon as "it" might be expressed in community political actions. We assessed the people by general "areas" of geographic proximity, the official membership offices held as well as normal general reputational and key issue/participants" approaches to identifying community power.[10] We found several clear "key actors" in the BOCES public education group and a preacher in the Burlington area. In addition, the Hartford study identified several clear socio-political coalitions. In spite of this success, we still feel a finding of generalized or overall

classification of "power structure" which could be conventionally used are dangerously static in their implicit "world views" for 1982 realities. These "structure" descriptions are easy to articulate but may be used for making and implementing social policy without actual appreciation of contextual or human variability.[11] Our actual descriptions of "power structure" revealed indirect "clues" of the process of where to pursue the human action of actual community control, but to try and make our study findings intellectually honest, we consciously make no claim to have captured actual descriptive accuracy of the play in rural community governance.

Only the people acting truly know what social control means for living their daily lives. To support the reality of what a "closed" local community might also mean we fould many other people in places such as Hartford, New York and in the rural areas of Northern Vermont remain as fiercely independent, intellectually related to pragmatic "common sense" and fervent supporters of public schools. These folks were likely to designate the outsider "them" as a reflection of bureaucratic complexity (e.g., the "welfare types" in trailers and the post office redesignation of non-local routing) as "it" was impacting on their daily lives and they might use religion as one channel to express their individual suspicion of "them" meanings in "good" social government. These other type of "fundamental" citizens may be "old fashioned" to outsiders but some of the most rural residents we interviewed were "provincial" in the Next Whole Earth Catalog's[12] "access to tools" manner. They run "conservative" governments but definitely value people and appreciate modern living qualitative improvements to traditional tasks. Finally, some of the citizens most supportive of public schools also call themselves "fundamental", "evangelical" or even "born again" Christians. While they may relate their civic and sacred activities to an assumed mystical guidance, such allegiance is an abstract feeling of "guided destiny"

rather than the operational rigidity of true deterministic socio-political control sometimes found in non public school supporters. In Hartford, a Christian preacher that demanded such total person dependence was "run out of town". Similarly only three children from two families in this town of 1200 attend a Fundamental school in nearby Truthville, New York.

In conclusion, our findings seem to allow a very "thick" description of certain configurations of governance "climate" during the fall of 1981 and Spring of 1982 but little more pragmatically useful information for some generic "power structure" classification. Structure seem defined most closely as it is actually experienced; consequently our present power structure schemes seem to imply too much in static assumptions of formal organization and fixed impersonal relationships. For example, all external observers can systematically say about the "influentials" in the Hartford, New York "Yoke" religious connection is that they are several individuals continually associated by common community tasks and a common want to be together. These "key actors" also have formal denominational identification, but this is less important in describing the "potential play of power" which this structure could exercise to affect the future of Hartford's public schools.

(4): A fourth conceptual premise which was assessed by this study concerned the "network linkages" between centralized and localized constituencies when both are claiming allegiance to the same ideological banner. Our study focused upon possible "political network" connections to national interest groups coordinated by;

1) the Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress during primary elections,
2) the Council on National Policy and mass audience direct mailing efforts of Richard Viguerie,
3) Eagle Forum's "Stop ERA Committee",

4) the research agenda of the Heritage Foundations (policy studies)

and, finally,

5) Moral Majority.

In other words, we tried to study possible "linkages" the most visable and vocal of the national "fundamentalist" interest groups. None of these national organizations were found to have a direct or sustaining relationship with the population studied.[13] Some respondents noted the "Old Time Gospel Hour" as a "good" television show, but made it clear that Rev. Falwell the person, and Moral Majority the socio-political organization, did not control their community or directly affect their daily life activities concerning school matters.

The closest actual arrangement of sustained centralized pragmatic control was related to the distribution of Accelerated Christian Education franchises (to fundamentalist schools). There was also a regional meeting held in Albany during October 1981 which demonstrated the intensive socialization and resocialization of local pastor-administrators and the capability of ACE to be a most powerful mobilizing effort. During this study there were approximately 150 ACE schools in New York alone. The Albany regional meeting drew 2500-3000 participants and the observed psychological commitment of the entire gathered group appeared authentic. During the meeting there was some suggestion that Accelerated Christian Education and another fundamentalist curriculum "packaging" concerns (ie. Beka Publishing Company) were "coordinated" with the Moral Majority, but this could not be empirically confirmed or denied.

(5): The final premise of what the concept of fundamentalism might be pragmatically was the relation of the identified population to the technological, rationalistic language of modern "social policy". The specific vehicle used to test understanding of modern "policy" articulations were the "new federalism" changes in K-12 compensatory funding found in the Educational Consolidation Act (known as ECIA). This Act transformed the various titles and grant structure

of federal subsidy to schools in several important ways; (a) a new "language" where dollar allocations were identified as "Chapter 1" and "Chapter 2" monies, (b) a considerable lessening in oversight-regulatory "constraints" by federal and state authorities and concurrent reemphasis on "local control" and (c) most important, a specific stipulation (the formal statement during time of this study) that allocated monies to local school districts must be distributed to public and private schools serving children of the state. In the Fall 1981 and Spring 1982 there was continual discussion in Washington, D.C., Albany and Montpelier as to what "the Chapters" would mean to existing forms of subsidy resource distributions. In short, knowledge of "new federalism" changes seemed a type of "modern policy" information which all educators "in the mainstream" would have some appreciation, especially fundamental pastor-administrators who would now face the possibility (or dilemma) of receiving such funds under the "new federalism" rationalization.

The actual solicitation of such information from fundamentalist educators took place in April and May 1982. In neither New York nor Vermont had many of the individuals interviewed even become familiar with "Chapters 1 and 2"; indeed, there was only the vaguest idea of the meaning of "new federalism" or "Reaganomics" for the non-local subsidy of education. We conclude that the fundamentalist "policy world" of providing church-schooling is almost unconnected to the "modern" forms of articulation which many university academics and state/federal analysts use to talk about both allocation and distribution of resources and the organizational meanings of governance.

In summary, the methodology of this particular study itself provides a pragmatic example of what seemed "to work" in studying the fundamental church-school phenomenon within select local rural communities. Conceptually, five different premises used to rationalize the collection of "pertinent" data were systematically compared to found results and analyzed for qualitative differences. Because we were unable to clearly determine the best conceptual

"lens", we present the results or findings of this study as a "heuristic" or "eclectic" amalgamation.[14] The common intellectual thread in all findings was our own direct pragmatic verification of observed reality by specific person examples. This remains our conceptual safeguard which hopefully, distinguishes a recursive "model" from mere speculation or a self fulfilling prophetic kind of logic.

Methodologically, a variety of conventional samplings, collection and analytical techniques failed to identify any "best" single practice. We rely upon and recommend the "mixed" and/or "multiple" approach to engage in a policy study of this sort.

NOTES SECTION

1. David Wiles and A.P. Johnston (principal investigators), "Study of Fundamentalist and Public Schooling in Small North Country Communities of Upper New York and Vermont," submitted August 1981, funded by Spencer Foundation October 1981, final report September 1982.

2. Donald Campbell and Julian Stanley Experimental and QuasiExperimental Designs (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1965).

3. William Turner "Reasons For Enrollment in Religious Schools" doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin at Madison, 1979.

4. Robert Tomenendal, A Study of Christian Schools in Virginia, a dissertation in progress, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, 1982.

5. George Ballweg, "The Growth in the Number and Population of Christian Schools Since 1966", dissertation, Boston University, 1980.

6. Jack Douglas, Investigative Social Research (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1976.)

7. somewhat analogous to what Robert Presthus, Peter Rossi, Terri Clark and Fred Wirt recommend to resolve the dilemma of type of method predetermining findings in the "Hunter-Dahl" power structure efforts. See footnote 12.

8. the investigators would like to especially thank Alan Peshkin, University of Illinois for his critique of this study from the "immersion" perspective.

9. "conventional" means the classic mechanistic research approach that often creates deterministic or unrealistic static assumptions about social phenomenon. See F. Capra The Turning Point (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982) and Douglas Hofstadter Godel, Escher, Bach (New York: Vintage, 1981).

10. Karl Weick A Psychological Way of Organizing (Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1979).

11. We consider, with Dewey, the actual conduct of research to the best pragmatic test of a priori property space classifications in any honest design format. Further, no human acting as social policy researcher should ever feel the need to apologize for not "being right" (t-1 to t) more than 70 percent of time if he or she is "good" at their specialization. Seventy percent "success" at fathoming "rural" and "religion" in the 1980s school-community context seems a credible job.

12. Fred Wirt and Willis Hawley, The Search for Community Power (Bevely Hills, Sage Publications, 1974).

13. for an excellent overview of the meanings of difference, distinctiveness and symmetry in social research and "micro" versus "macro" classifications see Gregory Bateson Mind and Nature (New York: Bantam 1980).

14. Stewart Brand (ed) The Next Whole Earth Catalog (Sausalito California: The Warehouse, October 1981).

NOTES - (cont'd)

15. Clifford Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures (New York: Basic Books, 1979) especially chapters 1 and 8. We were particularly sensitive to congruence of "epoch" and "essentialism" arguments.

16. see Graham Allison Essence of Decision (Boston: Brown Little) 1971, The "blend" of models II, III, and IV.